

DEC 26 2006

Application No. 10/517,717

Reply to Office Action

*REMARKS*

The Office has set forth a species election requirement. The Office states that claims 1-89 are pending in this application and that applicant is required to elect a single disclosed species.

The Office's statement that claims 1-89 are pending is erroneous. Applicants filed a Preliminary Amendment on December 10, 2004. As a result, claims 81-87 and 90-97 should be currently pending. Note the patent application published with the correct set of pending claims.

Applicants elect, with traverse, the species shown in claim 83. Claim 82 is generic. Claims 83 and 94-97 read on the elected species. The available evidence does not justify the restriction or election requirement. There would not be a serious burden on the Examiner to consider all the claims together in one application.

The Office states that "claims 1-89" are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentability distinct species comprising a "multitudinous" of cyclic and linear peptides. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office is in error. As discussed, the correct pending claims are 81-87 and 90-97, which do not encompass linear peptides. Only cyclic peptides are covered by the pending claims. Accordingly, there would be no serious burden on the Examiner to search and conduct an examination of all the claims in one application.

A favorable decision is solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone

Application No. 10/517,717

Reply to Office Action

conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Xavier Pillai, Ph.D., Reg. No. 39,799  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: December 26, 2006

M:\clients\NIHVAmd\231461 ROA (12-26-06).doc